



CITY OF VINCENT

MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

7 October 2025

Table of Contents

1	Declaration of Opening / Acknowledgement of Country	3
2	Apologies / Members on Leave of Absence	3
3	(A) Public Question Time and Receiving of Public Statements	3
	(B) Response to Previous Public Questions Taken On Notice	11
4	Applications for Leave of Absence	16
5	The Receiving of Petitions, Deputations and Presentations	16
6	Confirmation of Minutes	17
7	Announcements by the Presiding Member (Without Discussion)	17
7.1	Finalist – 2025 Seniors Awards	17
8	Declarations of Interest	17
	Reports	18
	Items Approved " <i>En Bloc</i> ":	18
9.3	No. 389 (Lot: 3; D/P: 1283) Bulwer Street, West Perth - Proposed Three Grouped Dwellings	19
11.1	Financial Statements as at 31 August 2025	22
11.2	Authorisation of Expenditure for the Period 01 August 2025 to 31 August 2025	23
11.3	Investment Report as at 31 August 2025	24
12.1	Information Bulletin	25
12.2	Report and Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting held on 3 September 2025	26
	REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION	28
9.1	No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth - Proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Cafe to Restaurant/Cafe and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) - Section 31 Reconsideration	28
9.2	No. 5-11 (Lot: 50; D/P: 86336) Howlett Street, North Perth - Change of Use from Office and Warehouse to Industry - Light and Trade Display	31
13	Motions of Which Previous Notice Has Been Given	33
14	Questions by Members of Which Due Notice Has Been Given (Without Discussion)	33
15	Representation on Committees and Public Bodies	33
16	Urgent Business	33
17	Confidential Items/Matters For Which the Meeting May be Closed	33
18	Closure	33

**MINUTES OF CITY OF VINCENT
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE E-MEETING AND AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC CENTRE,
244 VINCENT STREET, LEEDERVILLE
ON TUESDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2025 AT 6:00 PM**

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Ron Alexander	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward
	Cr Jonathan Hallett	South Ward
	Cr Ashley Wallace	South Ward
	Cr Sophie Greer	South Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	Emma Simmons	A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Karsen Reynolds	Manager Development & Design
	Mitchell Hoad	Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability
	Alex Harris	Governance Officer
	Carrie Miller	Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer
	Anita Radici	Executive Assistant – Strategy & Development
	Kristijan Korunoski	Programmer, Pro Av Solutions (left at 6:47pm during item 9.2)
Public:	Approximately 10 members of the public.	

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING / ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon declared the meeting open at 6:00pm and read the following Acknowledgement of Country statement:

“The City of Vincent would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and pay our respects to Elders past and present, and acknowledge that as a Council the City of Vincent has a role to play in working towards reconciliation and justice for First Nations people.”

2 APOLOGIES / MEMBERS ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3 (A) PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The following questions and statements were received at the meeting. This is not a verbatim record of questions and statements made at the meeting.

3.1 Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

Lesley Florey's full statement can be heard [here](#). She asked the following questions during her statement:

- Can you please advise the independent consultant and/ or company who was engaged to assist with the CEO performance review?
- Requested a full copy of the Pozi mapping system, showing the City of Vincent stormwater drainage pipes across the entire City.

3.2 Dan Loden of Mt Hawthorn

Dan Loden's full statement can be heard [here](#). He asked the following questions during his statement:

- Requested an update on the City's target of net zero by 2030.
- Asked whether the first electric waste truck has rolled out yet?
- Enquired about Administration's approach to carbon offsets as the City approaches the net zero target.

There being no further speakers, Public Question Time closed at approximately 6:07pm.

The following questions and statements were submitted in writing prior to the meeting.

Administrations' responses will be provided in the Agenda for the 11 November Ordinary Council Meeting.

Dudley Maier of Highgate

Tonight marks the last meeting for Councillor Ron Alexander. I can't be at the meeting to say this in Ron's presence, but I want to thank him for four years of service to the community.

Ron has been an independent voice, not swayed by peer-pressure, but guided by his own moral compass. I have not always agreed with some of the decisions he made, but I was always grateful that he had to courage to speak up when he did not agree with something. Sadly, this is something that is becoming more of a rarity.

Not many community members seem to know who is on council anymore. When I speak to people, they will occasionally mention that this council member, or that council member got back to them. Sadly, the majority of such comments are about the council members who don't get back to them. The observation that sticks in my mind the most involved Ron.

About eighteen months ago I became aware that a community member sent all council members an email asking about a recent decision of council. Six council members responded, and three didn't have the courtesy to respond. While most responses were reasonable, the one that stood out was the one from Ron. It was probably the shortest response and simply gave his phone number and suggested that the person give him a call. It struck me that he was the one who wanted to actually speak to the community, with the courage to explain his position, and to listen to their feedback.

I probably should have contacted Ron more often over the last four years. But that is water under the bridge. What I would like him to seriously consider, however, are the two suggestions I gave him the day before I left for overseas.

The first suggestion was that he should consider putting down on paper his fascinating life story. From growing up in our local area; to his time in the WAFL and VFL; to his time as the Eagle's first coach and his dealings with the powerful in the WA footy world; to his long time in charge of the Department of Sports and Recreation under a number of different ministers and political parties; his time setting up an effective community group in the area he lived in; and finally his time on council.

I do remember Ron telling me of how he was co-opted into an Aboriginal basketball team. This was probably because of his height, and probably because of his belief in social justice. The team probably knew that he would not put up with any racist crap - it would only make him clumsy and prone to run straight through anybody with a loose lip, like a 115kg, 2 metre tall lump of concrete. There must be hundreds of similar anecdotes.

And the second suggestion I made to him was that he should transfer all his assets into Marilyn's name before his biography was published, just to be on the safe side in these litigious times.

So, thank you Ron, enjoy the next chapter of your life, and the next chapter of your book.

Andrea Tolle of North Perth – Item 9.1

The following statement was received 1/10/2025.

With reference to yesterday's briefing of the above cafe, I wish to advise that it was incorrectly mentioned that the parking issues on Venn Street were declining with people now parking legally. This is 100% not the case. See below photos taken over the last few days which clearly shows people continuing to park illegally.

I have been home all day in the last month and have not once seen parking inspectors monitor the street. I have also phoned the rangers when I had cars parked on my verge Saturday before last, reporting 2 illegally parked cars and nobody turned up and no tickets were issued. Other neighbours mention they don't call anymore as nobody turns up anyway. The weekends are the absolute worst. I would say you could issue tickets all day long if a ranger was in the street. I say the decline in the parking infringements is because nobody monitors the street and calls are not being attended to.

I have told 2 delivery drivers for the cafe to remove their trucks from illegally parking over the yellow line as I happened to be out the front at the time. This is in the last 24 hours. The Uber eats drivers think the rules do not apply to them, they park wherever they like as they will only be "a few minutes". Staff from the Cafe are being collected after their shift (a young lady at around 3:00pm) and the person collecting them decides parking over the yellow line on my side of the street is ok as the driver is sitting in the car so can move if need be. He is there waiting parked illegally every day.

I would like the incorrect statement to be corrected at the briefing and further would like to know when some proper action will be taken regarding the current parking issues on Venn Street.

The following was received 2/10/2025.

This is what I mean about the delivery trucks (see pics below), and because I took a photo I had abuse hurled at me.





The

following statement was received 6/10/2025.

Statement and questions regarding 500 Fitzgerald St, La Mortazza

My house is located directly across from the café parking driveway. I have lived here for over 16 years. I strongly object to an evening venue in this location.

Since the café opened it has changed the previous peacefulness of the street and has had a lot of negative effects on living in Venn Street. I ask you put yourself in resident's shoe's and see if you would like an evening venue directly across the street from your home that you've worked hard all your life to purchase and all the headaches that come with it, when all you want is a peaceful living environment. This is the reason I bought a house in a quite street in the first place.

This Café is open every day of the week and the only peaceful time is after 3:00pm when they close. It is very distressing that the council is contemplating a nighttime approval.

The issues continue with the constant illegal parking by patrons, delivery drivers and Uber eats drivers. It goes on every day and is particular bad on Saturdays and Sundays. I have personally been abused by drivers when asking them to not park illegally. Some with the delivery company's details on their truck. Uber Eats drivers think they can park anywhere as they "will only be a few minutes". They just don't care and should not be approved to operate in the evening.

Evening parking issues would be made worse with constant headlights shining into bedroom windows as well as the noise from people being frustrated and beeping their horns because they can't get through (this happens currently during the day).

I would expect to be able to drive home in the evening and park in front of my own house. With the illegal parking that is consistent in the street, how will the council handle this? Am I expected to park in another street away from my home and walk by myself in the dark?

I look after my verge as it's the only place I have to park, pulling out weeds from the garden bed, sweeping up leaves and picking up rubbish. I don't do this for other cars to have a nice spot to park. The No Parking sign gets ignored consistently, the sign I had to pay for, for the issue not caused by me in the first place.

The acoustic noise survey should be carried out outside of the Cafe as well as out the front it can be very loud ie. Car doors closing or slamming, people gathering in groups talking as they are walking to their cars, carrying on conversations, saying their goodbyes, people going outside on the verge to talk loudly on their phones, often on speaker. All of this happens currently and should not have to be tolerated in the evenings. Please advise if the noise survey has the outside included? If it hasn't, I would request it be included.

The street itself has become dangerous with the numerous blind spots when going into and out of the café driveway with the cars parked on the south side of Venn Street. Coming into Venn from Fitzgerald and vice versa is also dangerous as cars are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road and quite often cars are stuck on Fitzgerald and are not able to turn because cars are banked up on the wrong side of the road on Venn Street trying to get out. This gets even more dangerous when cars are parked illegally on the yellow line right at the intersection, which happens often. In the dark this would become even more of a safety hazard than it already is.

The Café owner has a proven history of not following the approved opening hours and consistently opened outside of trading hours. The council rewarded her with approving earlier opening hours.

The Café owner has blatantly lied. An example is when they opened one evening with a very loud band playing they advised council that it was a staff Christmas Party when residents complained. This was not the case as the evening opening was advertised on social media to which I have the proof. This was mid week and they had a band playing which vibrated through my house, was very loud and was completely inappropriate.

This café location was never meant for an evening venue serving alcohol. Surely a couple of blocks up the road in the North Perth precinct, amongst other restaurants, bars, shops etc is the only suitable area for this.

There is a worry of alcohol induced anti social behaviour in a residential street, making people feel unsafe in their own homes.

I have spoken with local real estate agents who agree that an evening venue in a place like this can decrease surrounding property values and will be a house not sought after by families with children due to close proximity of alcohol being served in a night time venue and the dangerous traffic hazards of the street, as well as all the parking issues.

I had a visitor to my home on Sunday who was visibly shaken as she was stressed trying to park in front of my house. A person beeping at her and yelling something out the window, frustrated because she had to take time to manoeuvre her way in due to other parked cars. Just continued anti social behaviour in the street, due to the traffic and parking issues caused by the Café.

Questions to council

- 1) If the council are going to allow the evening licence will they be providing parking rangers for the ongoing parking problems created by the venue? What will their availability be? Lately it has proved difficulty to contact a ranger to come out on the weekend. Will this be rectified?
- 2) Does the noise survey cover outside of the café when people are going to and from the venue, gathering in groups on the way back to their cars, outside talking on their phones, slamming car doors, additional traffic noise in the street, Uber Eats drivers etc? All these are occurring currently during the day and can be quite loud. If the noise survey does not include this will this survey be conducted and included?
- 3) As the parking bays were taken away from the units and given to the café, does this mean the unit visitors and tenants parking no longer complies? Please clarify total parking bays that are needed to be available for the whole building including units and café and the amount of total seating the café can have in relation to this and what they actually do have? I see they use the tea cups as seating as well as people seated on the grass out on the verge. I highly doubt this complies currently and request clarification on this. At the very least this needs to be reviewed as it is not working currently.

In addition please also circulate the below photos taken over the last 24 hours as further evidence and I would like to point out that Rafaella the Cafe owner drove the maroon car off when she saw me take a photo. That is the car parked the wrong way around on the yellow line blocking access to turning left onto Fitzgerald. This is clear evidence the Cafe owner has a complete disregard for legal parking.



Martin Morgan of North Perth – Item 9.1

I wish to register my strongest objection to allowing a bar license and/or extended trading hours into the evening

Because of the following reasons:

1. Limited parking, already chaos during the day. And to count an ACROD parking bay just for the café, when it was intended always for the whole complex, is dishonest. The block owners who are related to the café operator have been robbing parking bays originally allocated to the residents of the building, which has 22 units, with 2 visitor bays on site but outside the gated area. The café has only 6 designated bays allocated for the café, and these are for staff and patrons. The two visitor bays are for the residents not the café as specified in the “Determination on Development Assessment” by the panel. It says the visitor car parking bays are to be marked and set aside for the residents as such. Not for the café. **The signage on site is very misleading.**
2. I believe an independent sound/acoustic report be requested, as past night events have destroyed my well being and ability to live peacefully in my own abode.
3. Under planning approval the café was **‘not to have any more than 28 patrons at any one time, seated’**. Please not the café has **52 black metal patron chairs and 4 stools**. On weekends they frequently have many more than 28 patrons (parking and traffic congestion is a nightmare). You can be assured that they will breach the maximum patrons, as they already do, and I have witnessed it.
4. Illegal parking- frequently occurs already on yellow lines by patrons and by delivery trucks. In the last week a car parked on the yellow line, cars could not pull off Fitzgerald Street. Car horns were blaring, and a near accident occurred. This is a common event and I have many photos to prove it.
5. I have been abused and threatened by one young Italian man parked illegally, who stalked me down the street and continued threatening me. Luckily another neighbour arrived and he finally backed off. I

had phoned the ranger, but no one arrived, so I phoned the police. These events are going to continue and escalate with the entitled clientele the café attracts.

6. I note the you were advised that complaints had decreased, that's because rangers are not responding, and non-existent on the weekends. I will now only contact the police as my rate payer funded rangers are not responding
7. The café has already destroyed the amenity of the area during day light hours, and it will be twice as bad if you allow the extended hours into the evening as a bar serving alcohol.

The Council has already destroyed the amenity of the area for residents during the day, and if you approve this, you will destroy our evenings

The owners have nothing but shown their inconsiderate behaviour to residents by lying to their faces, and harassing residents , plus trying to use Council Rangers to harasses car owners who have a legal right to park in Venn Street

If the Bar is approved there will be more car accidents and more significant conflict, which will erupt into disturbances, especially with drunken patrons in the evenings. Imagine if you were living next to this and say no to this proposal and stop any further attempts to get it approved.

Alex Uchanski of North Perth – Item 9.1

Dear City of Vincent,

I have prepared a short statement in relation to item 9.1 for the Council Meeting on 7 October 2025. I would like to highlight and put on the public record the risk of through-traffic at the Fitzgerald Street and Venn Street intersection where the applicant La Mortazza is located. Approaching this intersection is inherently risky for both pedestrians and vehicles, and that's during the day. Increased traffic flow after dark as a result of extended cafe operating hours at times of low visibility and little street lighting exacerbates this risk. The intersection is a genuine safety risk which a number of the Elected Members are alive to including Mayor Xamon, Cr Woolf and Cr Worner. There have been two vehicle crash incidents in the last twelve months at or adjacent to the intersection, and unrecorded near misses occur on a very regular basis. Approaching the intersection is like playing a game of roulette each time, being blind to oncoming traffic travelling on the wrong side of the road.

The North Perth Traffic Study may offer solutions, I emphasise *may* as we are yet to see any detail from it, and any treatments would be quite some time away yet - as per the agenda notes, the study wouldn't come to council until mid-2026, with the actual treatment of the intersection some years after that. Exacerbating an existing safety issue prior to treating the intersection would seem to me to be at best a risky proposition, and at worst an irresponsible and negligent one. The order of priorities must necessarily be the safety of the community passing through the intersection over the commercial interests of the cafe.

Andrew Buchanan of Leederville

To City of Vincent Councillors,

Context of statements: A 4WD was permitted, by the Council, under the residential e-permit scheme, to park unrestricted in a two hour (2hr) bay for over four months without moving a centimeter.

The following statements and questions follow from this event as I am opposed NOT to the residential e-permit scheme, OR to ratepayers parking for longer than the restricted time - my opposition stems from parking for unlimited periods - according to council up to three years without moving legally permitted.

Statements:

The City of Subiaco and the City of Perth, the closest analogies with respect to this council, DO not allow storage of vehicles on their roads. Any vehicle not moved within a week (e-permit inclusive) is considered unused and therefore classed as being stored. This abides with the constraints of the Local Government Act(1995) which states that "fair and equitable use" must be applied to such land. The City of Vincent's residential e-permit appears to contradict the 'fair and equitable' use of restricted time parking bays by making the bay, in certain instances, a selected individual ratepayers second garage. I would even suggest that most of the City of Vincent Councillors are not aware that selected ratepayers can park vehicles in high use, restricted bays, unmoved for three years.

In seeking evidence of how ratepayers were informed by council of this "long term parking" in restricted bays I was supplied with is statement from the Town of Vincent:

I quote " **The policy, nor the consultation specifically stated the wording 'long term parking', as this would be implied with the purpose of having a parking permit, to park beyond the relevant time restriction.**"

No reasonable person would interpret this as been granted unlimited, very long term parking making it a garage for a selected ratepayer and thereby restricting access to the parking for the general public. **Therefore I claim that the City of Vincent has been negligent with respect to the implications of the effects of this parking by-law.**

In fact I take it one step further and suggest that there are NO safety net procedures in place at the City of Vincent to prevent subtleties in the interpretation of policy that can have large impacts on the environment of ratepayers.

The City of Vincent residential e-permit conditions states that "unused" vehicles are not permitted. When challenged on the definition of unused the City of Vincent claimed that their interpretation is that as long the vehicle is registered it is not considered unused - by the way there is no-where I can find in the City of Vincent webpage where this is stated - again leading to the question of uninformed ratepayers and a negligent council. **What is the difference between an abandoned vehicle that has not moved for four months and a registered vehicle that has not moved for four months.**

"Fair and Equitable use" Local Government Act (1995) - real life example. After receiving illogical and stubborn response to my questions at a council meeting on this topic I moved my complaint to the ombusman. Subsequently the vehicle, the subject of this complaint, moved. The next day I counted 32 vehicles using that same bay - I just hope that the council sees the error of their policy by excluding these multiple users for the benefit of one illegally privileged ratepayer who has a de-facto extension of his property at the expense of rest of the public.

The City of Vincent appears to moving in the opposite direction to most inner city councils around the world with respect to encouraging the ratepayers to take up, in some cases multiple e-permits per dwelling. Inner city living comes with the benefit of the infra-structure provided over many years of development - one of these is public transport. If you choose to live in high density areas DO NOT expect to house three vehicles or your kids vehicles in limited space - if this your choice move away to the outer suburbs.

Questions

1. How can the City of Vincent act outside of the intentions of the Local Government Act 1995 - which states that "fair and equitable" use of such land must be applied. Sure the council has a mandate to manage the crown land, however they should not have the power to manage outside of the intentions of the law by granting privileged rights to individual ratepayers at the expense of the general ratepayers and public of Western Australia? Council should be reminded that they do not own the land - it is for everyone to use.
2. Why is it that administrators within council formulate policy without the scrutiny of safety nets - which independent arbiter inspects the fine details of policy for loop holes such as the illegal and illogical long term implications of the residential e-permit parking policy in restricted bays?
3. What is the vision of the City of Vincent with respect to living in a high density area - is the CoV encouraging the use of residential e-permits as a future source of revenue or are they looking towards "15 minute cities" and the use of public transport as a solution in high density areas?

(B) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Administration's responses are in italics below:

Glenn Christie of Mt Lawley – Item 9.2

I respectfully request that you defer Agenda Item 9.2 regarding the proposed alterations and additions to the place of worship at 42 Mary Street, Highgate, in this evening's meeting. I believe further information from the Administration and the applicant is necessary to address some concerns I have.

Questions**Community consultation**

- 1.1) Was sufficient community consultation carried out in accordance with the City's Consultation policy to facilitate informed decision making?

Yes. Community consultation was correctly carried out in accordance with the City's [Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy](#).

This included a consultation period of 14 days with letters sent to adjoining and adjacent properties, a sign erected on-site and website notification.

- 1.2) Despite being located just 45 meters from the development, I did not receive any notification. According to the Officer's report, nine letters were sent out, with three (?) of those potentially going to properties directly or indirectly owned or associated with the development site. Does the City accept this is a fair representation of consultation with local residents?

Yes, as consultation was undertaken in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements. Notification letters were issued to the properties identified as adjoining or adjacent to the subject site (shown in Attachment 1 of the Officer Report). Whether or not adjoining or adjacent properties are under the same ownership does not affect the requirement to notify them.

Notification letters were also complimented by an on-site sign and website notification to ensure awareness extended beyond those directly notified and to invite the broader community to provide comment.

- 1.3) A notice was placed on the rear wall of the neighbouring property advising of the development. Does the City accept that this notice may have misled residents on the exact property and buildings being developed and should have been correctly located on the development site?

No. Administration is satisfied the sign was appropriately located and clearly identified No. 43 Mary Street as the site of the proposed development, complying with consultation requirements. The sign was affixed to the solid street fence directly adjacent to the subject site, within 1 metre of the lot boundary and facing Harold Street, ensuring it was clearly visible to passing residents and pedestrians. This is shown in images below. The location was agreed as suitable following discussion with the applicant, who raised concerns about damaging the heritage building and noted there was no grassed area available for a ground rod. On this basis, the City accepted placement at the end of the fence as sufficient.



Current non-compliance

- 1.4) At the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) on 20 November 2007 (Item 10.1.3), the applicant stated that the building was to be used as a temporary archive for a period of three to five years. Did the Council resolution in fact provide for a permanent change of use or just for three to five years; is the current usage as archives etc now non-complainant or compliant with the 2007 approval?

The current usage is compliant with the 2007 approval. The approval issued at the Ordinary Council Meeting on 20 November 2007 was granted on a permanent basis and was not limited to a temporary timeframe.

- 1.5) At the OCM on 10 March 2009 (Item 9.1.6), the City approved a temporary car park at the adjoining 197 Harold Street for a period of three years. Has the owner of this separate development site applied for an extension since this approval expired in November 2012, or therefore is the current usage as a temporary car park now non-complaint and should be rehabilitated?

No, the approval for a temporary car park at No. 197 Harold Street expired in November 2012 and has not been extended. The City will review the time-limited approval and landscaping conditions through its compliance processes, and the Development Compliance team will contact the owner if further information is required.

The matter raised relates to an adjacent site and separate approval and is not relevant to the assessment of the current application.

- 1.6) Can the City confirm that 197 Harold Street is currently zoned residential and the owner can remove and revoke the current temporary car park bays without notifying with the City?

Yes, No. 197 Harold Street is zoned Residential. The car bays on the site were approved on a temporary basis, and the owner may remove them at any time. There is no requirement for notification to or approval from the City to discontinue their use.

- 1.7) There are additional non-compliance issues with the 2009 temporary approval (see 1.9 below). The conditions imposed were for the provision of one tree per four car bays and new lawn and landscaping on the northern and eastern boundaries. Sixteen years later, these requirements have still not been met. What actions, and dates of actions, has the City undertaken since 2009 to enforce this condition and will the City act today to enforce said conditions?

The City has only recently become aware of this matter and has commenced a compliance investigation. As part of this process, the City will review the conditions of the 2009 temporary approval, including landscaping requirements, and determine the appropriate actions in accordance with the City's Compliance and Enforcement Policy.

The development.

- 1.8) The Officers report states the application is for quote ... *'Alterations and additions to Place of Worship'*. Does the City acknowledge that Recommendation 1, by not referencing the 2007 use ... *'Place of Public Worship Building comprising Prayer Room, Library, Museum, Office, Archival Storage, Reception, Kitchen and Toilets with Associated Additions and Alterations'*, that the 2007 approval is now no longer valid because the development is not to the Place of Worship, it's for the adjoining hall/achieves?

This development application would effectively replace the previous 2007 approval, if approved. The City has simplified the description to align with the current Local Planning Scheme No. 2, and all of the previously approved uses fall within the broader "Place of Worship" land use. The 2007 approval remains valid up until this development application (if approved) is substantially commenced.

- 1.9 The Officer's report states that the northwestern car park will be used to facilitate parking, and the development plans also make reference to using parking bays at 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street due to no (archive staff and visitors) bays at 42 Mary Street. Was the School Hall at 40 Mary Street development application circa Jan 2011 reviewed and considered as part of this development application as there was also a shortfall of bays granted; and why has the Officers report stated that 197 Harold Street is available parking?

Car parking is not an area for discretion as part of this application, as the development meets the deemed-to-comply standards of the City's Non-Residential Parking Policy.

This is because the current application proposes an 8m² increase in net lettable area (NLA), which does not generate any additional parking demand. Seven bays were required under the existing NLA and seven bays are required under the proposed NLA.

The 2007 development approval was not contingent on bays at adjoining properties.

The reference to parking at 197 Harold Street is based on a condition of the 2009 approval which required that the car park be directly associated with the Sacred Heart Church. It has since come to the City's attention that this approval has lapsed, and the matter will now be investigated through the City's compliance processes.

- 1.10 Why is the City allowing this development to proceed when there are outstanding issues relating to the 2007 and 2009 where the current usage and designated car parking are now non-complainant, yet stated as being part of this development? The City now not dismiss these as separate development site due to the Officers report connects all there 'sites'.

The 2007 approval for the Place of Worship and the 2009 approval for a temporary car park at No. 197 Harold Street are separate approvals and are not legally tied to one another.

The 2007 approval for the Place of Worship was supported on the basis of historic parking shortfalls on the subject site and did not rely on parking at No. 197 Harold Street.

While the 2009 approval provided additional bays on the adjoining lot to support the Church, the ongoing operation of the Place of Worship is not dependent on that parking.

As outlined above, the current proposal results in an 8m² increase in net lettable area, which does not generate any additional parking demand.

Any outstanding compliance matters at 197 Harold Street will be addressed separately and do not affect the validity or assessment of this application.

- 1.11 Has the City clearly articulated in the officer's report that the school (Lot 64 D/P 42775), the church and church hall (Lot 24 D/P 26565), and the residential lot (temporary car park) (Lot 5 D/P 672) are all independent freehold properties/development sites and not legally connected as a single (sic) site, 'precinct' or as stated on the map item 9.2 page 2 ' Sacred Heart Catholic Group'?

Yes. The primary school (Lot 64 D/P 42775), the church and church hall (subject site at Lot 24 D/P 26565), and the residential lot used as a temporary car park (Lot 5 D/P 672) are all separate freehold properties and independent development sites. They are not legally connected as a single site. They are connected through their common heritage listing as part of the Sacred Heart Catholic Group, which is why they are shown together in the report.

- 1.12 In addition to 1.11 above, a condition of the application, Recommendation 4, is that the stormwater is collected on (sic) site. Can the City advise how this is currently collected and how will this be undertaken when the development is built to the lot boundary on three sides? Has the Officer incorrectly assumed that the stormwater can be disposed via the adjoining properties and without imposing any TLA easement conditions? If the stormwater is being discharged into the privately owned ROW, who is responsible for the approval, compliance and maintenance of the drains in the ROW?

The applicant would be required to demonstrate compliance with stormwater management requirements at the building permit stage, in accordance with the National Construction Code. This is not a matter that needs to be demonstrated at the planning stage. The City will review the stormwater design as part of the building permit assessment to ensure compliance at that time.

- 1.13 The Officers report incorrectly states the development is quote ... 'is consistent with the established character of Harold Street'. Did the Officer not visit Harold Street and the intersection with Vincent Street (due to the visual dominance of the hall) to appreciate the residential c1906 onwards homes that are dominate in the vicinity and not dismiss our homes and the amenity of the area as just quote ... 'garages and solid school fences'?

A site visit was conducted and a detailed assessment undertaken of how the proposed development relates to its surrounding context. The Officer's report considered both the existing hall and church as well as the residential development along Harold Street.

The reference to garages and solid school fences was not intended to dismiss nearby homes but to describe the immediate built form context directly adjoining the subject site. The proposal was found to be consistent with the established character of Harold Street in this context, and this conclusion was reaffirmed through independent advice from the City's Design Review Panel.

- 1.14 Why is the City recommendation to support is despite the Officers later assessment in the report stating ... 'The above elements of the proposal do not meet the specified acceptable outcomes', allowing the building to be extended to the property boundary/footpath and not creating a passive street scape, interactive windows etc, contrary to the City's Built Form Policy and supporting the removal of four windows facing Harold Street?

The City's planning framework allows developments to be assessed either against the specified acceptable outcomes or through an objectives-based, performance pathway. In this case, the applicant has sought approval via the performance pathway, which is permitted under the Built Form Policy.

For the reasons detailed in the Officer's Report, the proposal was found to meet the relevant objectives, even though some acceptable outcomes were not strictly met. On this basis, the recommendation to support the application is consistent with the City's planning framework.

In addition, I note that a response has been provided in tonight's Agenda to questions raised by Mary Cropley of Mount Lawley ... *'The matter raised relates to an adjacent development site and a separate development approval and is not relevant to the assessment of the current application'*. I disagree. This development is dependant (car parking, stormwater, access etc) and related to, as mentioned numerous times in the Officer's report (see eg 1.9 above), 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street. If you now dismiss the relevance of the sperate development sites at 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street and the interdependencies with this development, this development may fail to meet the required planning conditions and policy/s.

As outlined above, the development has been assessed on its own merits and meets the required planning conditions and policies without reliance on adjoining sites. Matters relating to 197 Harold Street and 40 Mary Street are separate approvals and will be dealt with independently through compliance processes.

Summary

The hall is a very prominent and dominant feature in the landscape, with all three sides highly visible. To support an interactive streetscape, the development should not build right up to the front property line, as this would significantly increase the building's bulk and dominance. The current building boundary frontage is about four meters, but this would increase to about 16 meters, with 80% of the northern boundary adjacent to the footpath being a bulk wall with two tiny highlight windows and a small portico.

I am not opposed to the use of the hall for archive purposes, but I must highlight the lack of compliance by the City with past Council resolutions, the lack of (any) available parking on (sic) site, the bulk of the extension right on the footpath, which lacks visual appeal and; any conditions to retain the existing sculpture or future art et al. All of these issues appear to contradict the Council's planning policies. Therefore, I kindly request that the Council declines this development and ask the applicant to design a more interactive and passive building that aligns with the streetscape and addresses the parking concerns; and undertakes informed community consultation.

In addition, I invite the Councillors to meet with concerned local residents on site to assist you with your deliberations and an improved design and conditions.

Lesley Florey of Mt Hawthorn

Her full statement can be found [here](#).

Questions

Would like an update on the GHD survey data and mapping of the stormwater drainage in the City, as per the drainage technical memorandum December 2022.
Has data and mapping been completed?

Yes, the City maintains drainage data, which is mapped within its internal Pozi mapping system.

Has this been made available to residents?

Members of the community may request specific drainage information (relevant to their property) from the Pozi mapping system by contacting the City of Vincent.

Has the State Records office been updated and if so, when?

The City manages and maintains drainage data within its internal Pozi mapping system and does not transmit this information to the State Records Office.

Have any of the affected people with stormwater drains running through and under their property been advised? If so, how many and under what circumstances was this information provided?

Through ongoing maintenance works on stormwater pipes located within or beneath private properties, affected property owners have been advised of any proposed remedial works.

At the April 2025 meeting I formally requested information regarding the total expenditure of the small underground stormwater storage and infiltration system installed at Menzies Park.

Specifically, the cost of the system itself, installation, groundworks, turf replacement and associated labour costs. I have not yet received a response; can a response now be provided?

The total cost for installing the infiltration system at Menzies Park was \$129,715.00.

Please provide the following information regarding drainage maintenance at Menzies Park:
What were the dates in 2025 that the Council cleaned the drains around Menzies Park?

The pits at Menzies Park were cleaned in July 2025.

When was the drain on Menzies Park oval next to the playground last cleaned?

The pits at Menzies Park near to the playground were cleaned in July 2025.

For the 2024 calendar year what was the total amount paid to contactors for drain cleaning works at Menzies Park?

There was \$75,194 spent on contractor services under drainage Maintenance works for the 2024-2025 financial year.

Could you also provide the following information:

1. Regarding the number of properties that have been UV lined since the works carried out on my property?

Two properties with drainage pipes have been relined since the works at Sasse Avenue.

2. If any such works have been undertaken, can you please provide the total cost for these works?

Total cost of works was \$91,000.00.

4 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

5 THE RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Mr Joe Algeri from Altus Planning made a presentation to Council on item 9.1, No. 500 (Lot 41; D/P 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth – Proposed Change of Use from Restaurant/Café to Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) – Section 31 Reconsideration. His full statement can be heard [here](#).

5.2 Mr Chris Walker from Nood Co made a presentation to Council on item 9.2, No. 5–11 (Lot 50; D/P 86336) Howlett Street, North Perth – Change of Use from Office and Warehouse to Industry – Light and Trade Display. His full statement can be heard [here](#). Mr Walker submitted a slideshow for our records, which has been uploaded to the City of Vincent website separately.

5.3 Mr Lex Barnett from TBB Planning also made a presentation to Council on item 9.2, No. 5–11 (Lot 50; D/P 86336) Howlett Street, North Perth – Change of Use from Office and Warehouse to Industry – Light and Trade Display. His full statement can be heard [here](#). Mr Barnett submitted a slideshow for our records, which has been uploaded to the City of Vincent website separately.

6 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Alexander

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 9 September 2025 be confirmed.

CARRIED (9-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

7 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

The Presiding Member Alison Xamon made the following announcement:

7.1 FINALIST – 2025 SENIORS AWARDS

The City of Vincent has been named a finalist in the 2025 WA Seniors Awards. This recognition reflects the City's strong commitment to supporting older members of our community through a wide range of practical and empowering initiatives.

This year's finalists include individuals and organisations who have made outstanding contributions to their communities, particularly in areas such as:

- Reducing social isolation
- Fostering intergenerational connection
- Promoting age-friendly initiatives
- Preserving cultural heritage
- Raising awareness of elder abuse.

The Awards celebrate the positive impact of these efforts, and I'm proud that the City of Vincent has been acknowledged for its work in this space. The City has delivered a number of targeted programmes, including:

- Awareness campaigns around falls prevention and elder abuse
- Support for carers and retirement planning
- Wellness technology for seniors
- Education on osteoporosis and chair yoga
- A variety of fitness opportunities
- And a number of other learning experiences and social opportunities.

These initiatives reflect the dedication of our team to informing, empowering, and connecting older people in our community.

The award ceremony will take place in November. Whether we win or not, being named a finalist is already a significant achievement—and I think we can all agree, we're already winners.

Her full statement can be heard [here](#).

8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

REPORTS

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, advised the meeting of:

- (a) **Items which are the subject of a question, comment or deputation from Members of the Public, being:**
Items 9.1 and 9.2.
- (b) **Items which require an Absolute Majority decision which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment, being:**
Nil.
- (c) **Items which Council Members/Officers have declared a financial or proximity interest, being:**
Nil.

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, requested Council Members to indicate:

- (d) **Items which Council Members wish to discuss which have not already been the subject of a public question/comment or require an absolute majority decision and the following was advised:**
Nil

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon therefore requested the A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance, to advise the meeting of:

- (e) **Unopposed items which will be moved “En Bloc”, being:**
Items 9.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.1 and 12.2
- (f) **Confidential Reports which will be considered behind closed doors, being:**
Nil

ITEMS APPROVED “EN BLOC”:

The following Items were adopted unopposed and without discussion “*En Bloc*”, as recommended:

COUNCIL DECISION

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Wallace

**That the following unopposed items be adopted “En Bloc”, as recommended:
Items 9.3, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 12.1 and 12.2**

CARRIED (9-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

9.3 NO. 389 (LOT: 3; D/P: 1283) BULWER STREET, WEST PERTH - PROPOSED THREE GROUPED DWELLINGS

Ward: South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Solar Access Diagram 
 4. Summary of Submissions - Administrations Response 
 5. Summary of Submissions - Applicants Response 
 6. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, **APPROVES** the application for Three Grouped Dwellings at No. 389 (Lot: 3; D/P: 1283) Bulwer Street, West Perth in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 6:

1. Development Plans

This approval is for Three Grouped Dwellings as shown on the approved plans dated 3 September 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. External Fixtures

All external fixtures, such as television antennas (of a non-standard type), radio and other antennas, satellite dishes, solar panels, external hot water heaters, air conditioners, and the like, shall not be visible from the street(s), are designed integrally with the building, and be located so as not to be visually obtrusive, to the satisfaction of the City;

3. Colour and Materials

The colours, materials and finishes of the development shall be in accordance with annotations shown on the approved plans and the schedule of finishes which forms part of this approval, unless otherwise approved by the City;

4. Visual Privacy

Prior to occupancy or use of the development, all privacy screening shown on the approved plans shall be installed and is to comply in all respects with the requirements of Clause 3.10 (Visual Privacy) of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 deemed-to-comply provisions, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Landscaping

Prior to the occupation or use of the development, all works shown in the approved landscaping plan shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans to the satisfaction of the City, and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the City, at the expense of the owners/occupiers;

6. Car Parking and Access

6.1 All vehicle parking, manoeuvring and access areas shall be constructed, paved and drained in accordance with the approved plans and are to comply with the requirements of Australian Standard AS2890.1, to the satisfaction of the City;

6.2 Prior to the occupation or use of the development, redundant or “blind” crossovers shall be removed and the verge and kerb made good to the City’s specification at the

applicant/owner's expense, to the satisfaction of the City; and

- 6.3 Walls, fences and other structures truncated or reduced to no higher than 0.75 metres within 1.5m of where walls, fences, other structures adjoin vehicle access points where a driveway meets a public street and where two streets intersect, with the exception of:**

- One pier at max width of 0.4 metres x 0.4 metres and 1.8 metres Decorative capping permitted to 2.0 metres; and
- Infill that provides a clear sight line;

7. Building Design

- 7.1 The surface finish of boundary walls facing an adjoining property shall be of a good and clean condition, prior to the occupation or use of the development, and thereafter maintained, to the satisfaction of the City. The finish of boundary walls is to be fully rendered or face brick; or material as otherwise approved; to the satisfaction of the City;**

- 7.2 Prior to the occupation or use of the development Functional Utilities, as defined by the Residential Design Codes, excluding solar collectors, shall:**

7.2.1 be located behind street setback areas and not visible from Bulwer Street or Gallop Street;

7.2.2 designed to integrate with the development; and

7.2.3 are located and/or screened so they are not visually obtrusive and minimise impacts to habitable rooms and private open space on the subject site and adjoining properties.

to the satisfaction of the City;

- 7.3 Prior to the occupation or use of the development Service Utilities, as defined by the Residential Design Codes, excluding letterboxes, shall be integrated into the design of the development and/or screened from view of the streets, to the satisfaction of the City. Where attached to a wall, meter boxes shall be painted the same colour as the wall to which they are attached, to the satisfaction of the City; and**

- 7.4 At least one window to each habitable room shall be operable in design, to the satisfaction of the City;**

8. Stormwater

Stormwater from all roofed and paved areas shall be collected and contained on site. Stormwater must not affect or be allowed to flow onto or into any other property or road reserve; and

9. Construction Management

- 9.1 The three grouped dwellings shown on the approved plans shall be constructed concurrently;**

- 9.2 Prior to the lodgement the building permit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is to be prepared and submitted to the City for approval. The CMP is to detail how the construction of the development would be managed to minimise the impact on the surrounding area. The CMP shall address the following matters in relation to works to take place on the site:**

- Public safety, amenity and site security;
- Contact details of essential site personnel;
- Construction hours;
- Noise control and vibration management;
- Sand, dust, stormwater and sediment control;

- Waste management;
- Traffic and access management on Bulwer Street, Gallop Street and the Right of Way;
- Parking arrangements for contractors and subcontractors;
- Communication plan with nearby properties; and
- Compliance with AS4970-2009 relating to the protection of trees around the development site; and

9.3 The approved CMP shall be implemented and complied with, for the duration of the construction of the development, to the satisfaction of the City.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.3

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (9-0)

11.1 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS AT 31 AUGUST 2025

Attachments: 1. Financial Statement as at 31 Aug 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Financial Statements for the month ended 31 August 2025 as shown in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.1

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (9-0)

11.2 AUTHORISATION OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE PERIOD 01 AUGUST 2025 TO 31 AUGUST 2025

- Attachments:
1. August 2025- Payments by EFT and Payroll 
 2. August 2025- Payments by Direct Debit 
 3. August 2025- Payments by Cheque 
 4. August 2025- Payments by Fuel Cards 

Recommendation:

That Council RECEIVES the list of accounts paid under delegated authority for the period 01 August 2025 to 31 August 2025 as detailed in Attachments 1, 2 and 3 as summarised below:

EFT payments, including payroll	\$ 6,208,839.21
Cheques	\$252.15
Direct debits, including credit cards	\$ 591,183.58
 Total payments for August 2025	 \$6,800,274.94

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.2

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

11.3 INVESTMENT REPORT AS AT 31 AUGUST 2025

Attachments: 1. Investment Report as at 31 August 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council NOTES the Investment Statistics for the month ended 31 August 2025 as detailed in Attachment 1.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 11.3

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.1 INFORMATION BULLETIN

- Attachments:**
1. Statistics for Development Services Applications as at the end of September 2025 - to follow due to end of month 
 2. Register of Legal Action and Prosecutions Monthly - Confidential
 3. Register of State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) Appeals - Progress Report as at 2 October 2025 
 4. Register of Applications Referred to the Metro Inner-North Joint Development Assessment Panel - Current 
 5. Register of Applications Referred to the Design Review Panel - Current 
 6. Register of Petitions - Progress Report - October 2025 
 7. Register of Notices of Motion - Progress Report - October 2025 
 8. Register of Reports to be Actioned - Progress Report - October 2025 
 9. Council Workshop Items since 22 July 2025 
 10. Council Briefing Notes - 2 September 2025 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council RECEIVES the Information Bulletin dated September 2025.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.1

Moved: Cr Worner, **Seconded:** Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “EN BLOC” (9-0)

12.2 REPORT AND MINUTES OF THE AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3 SEPTEMBER 2025

Attachments:

1. Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting of 3 September 2025 
2. Attachments - Confidential - Confidential

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. RECEIVES:

- 1.1 The Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee Meeting of 3 September 2025, at Attachment 1 and the Confidential Attachments Paper at Attachment 2;
- 1.2 The City's evaluation of the Office of the Auditor General reports on Purchasing Cards, Administration of Personal Leave, and Fraud Risks in Land Transactions; and
- 1.3 The Corporate Risk Register and Deep Dive Reviews.

2. APPROVES:

- 2.1 The proposed actions arising from the Annual Self-Assessment 2025
- 2.2 The risk management actions for the high and extreme risks; and
- 2.3 The closure of action items in the City's Audit Log, subject to Audit Action EA:2024/14 *Excessive Leave Balances* remaining open pending further assurances and trend data being provided to the Audit & Risk Committee.

3. NOTES:

- 3.1 The findings of the Annual Self-Assessment 2025;
- 3.2 The Audit and Risk Committee Forward Agenda, with the next three-year Internal Audit Plan to be moved to early 2026;
- 3.4 The Committee will receive internal audit progress updates, supported by a new tracking dashboard at each meeting;
- 3.5 Alignment of Corporate Risks to risk appetite and tolerance ratings; and
- 3.6 The status of the City's Audit Log at Attachment 1, and the subsequent actions required to support closure of outstanding items

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 12.2

Moved: Cr Worner, Seconded: Cr Wallace

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY “*EN BLOC*” (9-0)

REPORTS WITH DISCUSSION

9.1 NO. 500 (LOT: 41; D/P: 418433) FITZGERALD STREET, NORTH PERTH - PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE FROM RESTAURANT/CAFE TO RESTAURANT/CAFE AND SMALL BAR (AMENDMENT TO APPROVED) - SECTION 31 RECONSIDERATION

Ward: South

- Attachments:
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
 2. Development Plans 
 3. Applicant Letter 
 4. Acoustic Assessment 
 5. Venue Management Plan 
 6. 13 May 2025 Council Minutes and Refused Plans 
 7. Previous Joint Development Assessment Panel Approval 
 8. Summary of Submissions - Applicant Response 
 9. Summary of Submissions - Administration Response 
 10. Clause 67 Assessment 
 11. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004*, SETS ASIDE its decision dated 13 May 2025 and SUBSTITUTES a new decision to, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2, APPROVE the application for Change of Use from Restaurant/Café to Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) at No. 500 (Lot: 41; D/P: 418433) Fitzgerald Street, North Perth in accordance with the plans shown in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions, with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 11:

1. Development Approval

This approval is for a Restaurant/Café and Small Bar (Amendment to Approved) as shown on the approved plans dated 3 July 2024, 10 January 2025 and 11 August 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Use of Premises

- 2.1 This approval is for a Restaurant/Café and Small Bar as defined in the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2. The use of the subject land for any other land use may require further approval from the City;
- 2.2 The total number of persons attending the Restaurant/Cafe and Small Bar at any one time, including staff and customers, shall be limited to 32 persons. Of this total, no more than 16 patrons may be seated within the outdoor dining area, and only in the configuration shown on the approved seating plan, to the satisfaction of the City;
- 2.3 The Restaurant/Café and Small Bar shall be limited to the following hours of operation:
 - Sunday to Wednesday: 7:00am – 5:00pm;
 - Thursday to Saturday: 7:00am – 9:00pm; and
 - All deliveries shall be limited to 7:00am to 2:00pm, Monday to Friday; and
- 2.4 The premises may operate until 9:00pm on up to six (6) evenings per calendar year between Sunday and Wednesday, to the satisfaction of the City. The operator shall provide written notification to the City, as well as to adjoining and adjacent property owners and occupiers, at least five (5) business days prior to each additional evening, specifying the date, purpose of the operation, and proposed hours of operation, to the

satisfaction of the City.

3. Venue Management

The premises shall operate at all times in accordance with the approved Venue Management Plan dated 29 August 2025, to the satisfaction of the City;

4. Waste Management

The approved development shall operate in accordance with the approved Waste Management Plan dated 28 September 2018 at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Façade Design

5.1 Doors and windows and adjacent floor areas fronting Fitzgerald Street and Venn Street shall maintain an active and interactive relationship with the street, to the satisfaction of the City;

5.2 Glazing and/or tinting shall have a minimum of 70 percent visible light transmission to provide unobscured visibility between the street and the interior of the tenancy, to the satisfaction of the City; and

5.3 Internal security and privacy treatments shall be located and installed internally behind the glazing line or recessed, and shall be transparent and visually permeable to allow views inside the building and enable internal light sources to be seen from the street, to the satisfaction of the City;

6. Car Parking

Eight parking bays onsite shall be line marked with painted letters which read 'Café Parking' for the exclusive use of the Restaurant/Café and Small Bar;

7. Bicycle Facilities

A minimum of two short-term bicycle bays shall be provided in the Venn Street verge adjacent to the subject site, in a location approved by the City. These bicycle bays shall be designed in accordance with AS2890.3 prior to the use of the approved development, to the satisfaction of the City (refer Advice Note 10);

8. Parking Management

The premises shall operate in accordance with the approved Parking Management Plan dated 21 December 2023 at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

9. Signage

9.1 Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, the existing signs highlighted in red on the plans shall be removed, to the satisfaction of the City;

9.2 Prior to the commencement of the operating hours outlined in Condition 2.3, all signage shown on the approved plans shall be installed to the dimensions and locations shown on the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the City. The sign located to the northern elevation of the bin store shall be installed to the top left corner of the wall, replacing existing signage in this location, to the satisfaction of the City;

9.3 All signage is to be in strict accordance with the City's Local Planning Policy: Signs and Advertising, unless further development approval is obtained; and

9.4 All signage shall be kept in a good state of repair, safe, non-climbable, and free from graffiti for the duration of its display onsite; and

10. Acoustic Report

The premises shall operate at all times in accordance with the criteria and all recommended conditions/restrictions outlined approved acoustic report (Herring Storer Acoustics, dated 11 August 2025), to the satisfaction of the City.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.1

Moved: Cr Hallett, **Seconded:** Cr Worner

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (9-0)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace, Cr Greer and Cr La Fontaine

Against: Nil

At approximately 6:35, the Chief Executive Officer left the meeting and returned at approximately 6:40pm during item 9.1.

9.2 NO. 5-11 (LOT: 50; D/P: 86336) HOWLETT STREET, NORTH PERTH - CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE TO INDUSTRY - LIGHT AND TRADE DISPLAY

Ward: South

- Attachments:**
1. Consultation and Location Plan 
 2. Development Application Plans 
 3. Applicants Justification 
 4. Operational Management Plan 
 5. Acoustic Report 
 6. Traffic Impact Statement 
 7. Waste Management Plan 
 8. Summary of Submissions - Administrations Response 
 9. Summary of Submissions - Applicants Response 
 10. Clause 67 Assessment 
 11. Surrounding Area Analysis 
 12. Determination Advice Notes 

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council, in accordance with the provisions of the City of Vincent Local Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Metropolitan Region Scheme, **APPROVES** the application for a proposed Change of Use from Office and Warehouse to Industry – Light and Trade Display at No. 5-11 (Lot: 50; D/P: 86336) Howlett Street, North Perth in accordance with the plans provided in Attachment 2, subject to the following conditions with the associated determination advice notes in Attachment 12:

1. Development Approval

This approval relates to a Change of Use from Office and Warehouse to Industry – Light and Trade Display as shown on the approved plans dated 16 September 2025. No other development forms part of this approval;

2. Use of Premises

2.1 The hours of operation shall be limited to the following:

- Industry – Light: 7:00am to 3:00pm, Monday to Friday; and
- Trade Display: 9:00am to 2:00pm, Monday to Friday;

2.2 A maximum of ten (10) staff members shall be permitted on the premises at any one time, to the satisfaction of the City; and

2.3 No more than two (2) visitor groups shall be permitted on the premises at any one time;

3. Acoustic Report and Noise Management

3.1 Prior to lodgement of a Building Permit, the Acoustic Report prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd (13 August 2025) shall be updated to model noise emissions from the final plant, mechanical equipment and other noise-generating noise sources to be installed as part of the development. The updated report shall demonstrate that noise levels will comply with the assigned levels under the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997* at all times, to the satisfaction of the City; and

3.2 The development shall be designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with the recommendations, operational measures, and construction specifications contained in the approved Acoustic Report (SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd, 13 August 2025), as updated under Condition 3.1, to the satisfaction of the City;

Prior to occupation or use of the development, certification shall be provided by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant confirming that all recommended measures have

been implemented. The approved acoustic measures shall be maintained thereafter, to the satisfaction of the City;

4. Operational Management

The development shall operate in accordance with the approved Operational Management Plan dated 16 September 2025 at all times, to the satisfaction of the City;

5. Signage

All signage is to be in strict accordance with the City's Local Planning Policy: Signs and Advertising, unless further development approval is obtained;

6. External Fixtures

All external fixtures and building plant, including extraction fans, air-conditioning units, ducting, piping and water tanks, must be located and designed to minimise visual and noise impacts on surrounding properties. Such fixtures are to be screened from view of the street and adjoining properties to the satisfaction of the City;

7. Servicing and Deliveries

7.1 The approved Waste Management Plan dated 16 September 2025 shall be implemented at all times, to the satisfaction of the City. Any changes to the approved Waste Management Plan shall be incorporated into an updated Waste Management Plan to be submitted to and approved by the City; and

7.2 Incoming and outgoing deliveries shall occur between 7:00am and 3:00pm Monday to Friday only; and

8. Parking and Access

8.1 Prior to occupation or use of the development, twelve (12) off-street parking bays shall be provided in the locations shown on the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the City. Car parking and access areas associated shall be sealed, drained, and paved, and are to comply with the requirements of Australian Standard 2890.1, to the satisfaction of the City; and

8.2 Prior to occupation or use of the development, a minimum of four (4) onsite bicycle spaces shall be provided and designed in accordance with the approved plans and shall comply with AS2890.3, to the satisfaction of the City.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 9.2

Moved: Cr Woolf, **Seconded:** Cr Greer

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED (8-1)

For: Mayor Xamon, Cr Castle, Cr Alexander, Cr Worner, Cr Woolf, Cr Hallett, Cr Wallace and Cr Greer

Against: Cr La Fontaine

At approximately 6:47pm, Kristijan Korunoski (Pro Av Solutions) left the meeting and did not return.

13 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

14 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Nil

15 REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEES AND PUBLIC BODIES

Nil

16 URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

17 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS/MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED

Nil

18 CLOSURE

The Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, announced that tonight is the final meeting for Councillor Ron Alexander, Councillor Jonathan Hallett and the Manager Development & Design.

Mayor Xamon thanked the Manager Development & Design for her seven years of service and leadership, noting her role in transforming the team and enhancing community respect. She also acknowledged Councillors Ron Alexander and Jonathan Hallett for their contributions, highlighting Ron's commitment to inclusion and the City's liveability, and Jonathan's leadership in sustainability, public health, and social justice.

Her full announcement can be heard [here](#).

There being no further business, the Presiding Member, Mayor Alison Xamon, declared the meeting closed at 7:01pm with the following persons present:

PRESENT:	Mayor Alison Xamon	Presiding Member
	Cr Alex Castle	North Ward
	Cr Ron Alexander	North Ward
	Cr Suzanne Worner	North Ward
	Cr Nicole Woolf	North Ward
	Cr Jonathan Hallett	South Ward
	Cr Ashley Wallace	South Ward
	Cr Sophie Greer	South Ward
	Cr Ashlee La Fontaine	South Ward
IN ATTENDANCE:	David MacLennan	Chief Executive Officer
	Peter Varris	Executive Director Infrastructure & Environment
	Rhys Taylor	Executive Director Community & Business Services
	Jay Naidoo	Executive Director Strategy & Development
	Emma Simmons	A/Executive Manager Corporate Strategy & Governance
	Karsen Reynolds	Manager Development & Design
	Mitchell Hoad	Manager Strategic Planning & Sustainability
	Alex Harris	Governance Officer
	Carrie Miller	Corporate Strategy & Governance Officer
	Anita Radici	Executive Assistant – Strategy & Development

Public: Approximately one member of the public.

These Minutes were confirmed at the 11 November 2025 meeting of Council as a true and accurate record of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council Meeting held on 7 October 2025.

Signed: Mayor Alison Xamon

Dated